

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

**1.) Claim Status**

Claims 1-18 are pending and have not been amended. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

**2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owens, et al. (US 2003/0039244) in view of Sundaresan, et al. (US 2002/0101881). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Applicant's claimed invention is an Ethernet DSLAM configured to provide an advanced service binding for a requested service utilizing a plurality of attributes received from an authentication server. The attributes identify an access network for the requested service and a PVC on a local DSL loop associated with the end-user device. This configuration eliminates the need for a Broadband Remote Access Server (BRAS). The DSLAM also includes means for training a bridging network terminal to utilize the identified PVC to send upstream traffic from the end-user terminal to the DSLAM and to send initial downstream traffic from the DSLAM to the end-user terminal.

In the Applicant's previous response, it was argued that Owens discloses a conventional DSLAM and utilizes a conventional BRAS to configure the advanced service binding. At the bottom of page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Owens shows configuring an Ethernet DSLAM to provide an advanced service binding in paragraph 0045. However, paragraph 0045 says absolutely nothing about an Ethernet DSLAM providing the advanced service binding. In fact, paragraph 0045 does not even mention a DSLAM. Instead, paragraph 0045 discusses the BRAS, which the Applicant's claimed invention *eliminates*.

On page 4, next to last paragraph, the Examiner seems to contradict himself by stating that Owens FAILS to show an Ethernet DSLAM that receives attributes from the authentication server and uses them to provide the advanced service binding. He contends this is shown by Sundaresan in paragraphs 0014, 0018, 0020, and 0023.

These paragraphs, however, do not relate to this feature. If fact, it seems as though the Examiner is citing paragraphs from another, totally unrelated document.

Thus, the combination of Owens, which simply shows the state of the art as described in the Applicant's Background section, and Sundaresan, which seems to be totally unrelated to the claimed invention, does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Therefore, the withdrawal of the § 103 rejection and the allowance of claims 1, 4, 10 and 13 are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, 5-9, 11, 12 and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owens, et al. (US 2003/0039244) in view of Sundaresan, et al. (US 2002/0101881) in view of Holmgren (US 7,277,442). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner relies on the combination of Owens and Sundaresan for showing the limitations of base claims 1 and 10 from which claims 2, 3, 11, and 12 depend. However, as noted above, Owens and Sundaresan fail to disclose or suggest the limitations of the base claims. Holmgren is cited for showing limitations recited in the dependent claims, but also fails to disclose or suggest an Ethernet DSLAM configured to provide an advanced service binding for a requested service utilizing a plurality of attributes received from an authentication server. Claims 2, 3, 11, and 12 depend from base claims 1 or 10 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel and unobvious elements of claims 1 and 10. Therefore, the allowance of claims 2, 3, 11, and 12 is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 5 and 14 also recite an Ethernet DSLAM configured to provide an advanced service binding for a requested service utilizing a plurality of attributes received from an authentication server. These limitations are not taught or suggested by the combination of Owens, Sundaresan, and Holmgren. Therefore, the withdrawal of the § 103 rejection and the allowance of independent claims 5 and 14 are respectfully requested.

Claims 6-9 and 15-18 depend from base claims 5 and 14, respectively, and recite further limitations in combination with the novel and unobvious elements of their base claims. Therefore, the allowance of claims 6-9 and 15-18 is respectfully requested.

**3.) Request for Telephone Interview**

Due to the apparent total misunderstanding between what the Applicant considers to be the claimed invention, and what the Examiner considers the invention to be, the Applicant respectfully suggests a telephone interview would be useful to determine a logical next step. Therefore, a telephone interview is respectfully requested regarding independent claims 1, 5, 10, and 14, and the cited references Owens and Sundaresan. The Examiner may call the Applicant's attorney, Steven W. Smith, at the telephone number below to set up a mutually agreeable date and time.

**4.) Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-18.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven W. Smith, Reg. No. 36,684/

Date: April 20, 2011

Steven W. Smith  
Registration No. 36,684

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-1572  
steve.xl.smith@ericsson.com